

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 11, 12, 15-17, 21, and 23 have been amended to more clearly define the subject matter recited in those claims. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the claims are indefinite because the terms "storage location" and "storage space" recited in claims 2, 11, and/or 12 do not define any structural limitations.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's assertion, Applicants have amended claims 2, 11, 12, 15-17, 21, and 23 to more clearly define the structural features of the invention, as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ponticelli (U.S. Patent No. 4,742,978). In addition, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ponticelli. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Independent claims 11 and 12 each recite, among other things, "a first storage space of the audio rack having a first width defined by two first side surfaces" and "a second storage space of the audio rack having a second width defined by two second side surfaces, the second width being smaller than the first width."

Ponticelli discloses a mounting kit suitable for installing a variety of different model radios in different vehicles. The kit includes a rectangular frame (15) having opposing top and bottom walls (16, 17) and opposing side walls (18, 19), and a front

panel (23) for use with a particular radio installation. The Examiner appears to have construed that the two openings formed in the front panel (23) and the space extending therefrom into the frame (15) correspond to the recited “first storage space” and “second storage space” of claims 11 and 12. The Examiner also appears to have asserted assuming the terms “storage location” and “storage space” of claims 11 and 12 do not define any structural limitations, that the widths of the “imaginary” spaces in the frame (15) are “uniform along the depth of the respective storage space,” as recited in claims 11 and 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s expansive characterization of the Ponticelli’s teachings is incorrect because, among other things, each of independent claims 11 and 12 recites that the width of each respective storage space is “defined by two [...] side surfaces.” As is apparent, Ponticelli does not disclose or suggest, among other things, the above-mentioned configuration of first and second storage spaces, because the rectangular frame (15) defines only one storage space with only one width defined by opposing side walls (18, 19).

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11 and 12 define novel and non-obvious subject matter over Ponticelli. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of all pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 28, 2004

By:   
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220